

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 20-27, 31, 47-48, 52-61, 66-76, and 81-88 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7-13, 47, 60, and 75 are amended by the present response. Claims 33-46 and 65 are cancelled by the present response, the other noted canceled claims being previously canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 20-23, 25, 26, 31, 75-77, 80, 81, and 84-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,130,726 to Darbee et al. (herein "Darbee") in view of U.S. patent 5,978,013 to Jones et al. (herein "Jones"). Claims 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Darbee in view of Jones and further in view of Takahashi and further in view of Hirose. Claims 33-37, 39, 41-48, 52, 54-61, 67, 69, 70-74, and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Darbee in view of Takahashi, or in view of Nishazawa et al. (herein "Nishazawa"). Claims 38 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Darbee in view of Takahashi and further in view of Jones.

Initially, applicants note that the outstanding Office Action and the statements of the rejections cites references not made of record at this point in time. Specifically, in paragraph 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the outstanding rejection is indicated as based on Darbee in view of Jones and further in view of Takahashi, Hirose, or Nishizawa. Takahashi, Hirose, and Nishizawa have not properly been made of record in the present application as those references have not been cited, listed on a PTO-892 form, or provided to applicants. Applicants assume that those noted references to Takahashi, Hirose, and Nishizawa correspond to the references cited in the related application, U.S. serial number 09/751,113. However, Applicants still request that those references be formally made of record and cited on a PTO-892 form.

Addressing each of the above noted rejections, each of those rejections is traversed by the present response.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, each of the independent claims now clarifies that the “memory”, “storing means”, or “storing” step stores data into “a detachable IC memory card”. The claims also clarify that the operation of the “erasing unit”, “deleting” operation, “erasing means”, or “erasing” operation are “based on a user controlled input”.

According to the features clarified in the claims, and with reference to Figure 1 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the claimed control device or control operation store data into a detachable IC memory card, see, for example, IC card 2 in Figure 1 in the present specification and the present specification at page 12, lines 13-15. Further, the control device or control operation, and with reference to Figure 2 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, can erase stored data by a user manipulating the erase button 104, to thereby erase information recorded in the memory IC card 2 (see also the present specification at page 14, lines 17-20).

The above-noted features are clarified in each of the independent claims, and are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

First, neither Darbee nor Jones discloses or suggests the use of either a detachable IC memory card as a memory, nor an erasing operation based on a user controlled input. The outstanding rejection relies upon Darbee disclosing in Figures 1 and 2 the use of a memory 36, 40, neither of which is disclosed as a detachable IC memory card.

The Office Action also recognizes that Darbee does not disclose the feature of an erasing unit for deleting information stored in the memory, and the teachings in Jones are cited for that feature, and particular at column 10, lines 7-30. To that extent, Jones discloses “when coupon processor 98 has completed transferring the additional image information to

image memory 118, coupon processor 98 provides a print signal 130 to a printer 132.

Coupon processor 98 also deletes the coupon identification number from its memory.” See Jones specifically at column 10, lines 16-20.

In such ways, Jones at most discloses the use of a processor to automatically delete information from a memory after the information is transferred from the memory. Jones does not teach or suggest any type of *user control* of the deleting operation. Moreover, it would not at all have been suggested or possible to modify Jones to incorporate such a feature, as Jones provides no teaching or suggestion or recognizes any benefits of allowing a user to control the erasing or deleting operations.

In such ways, each of the claims distinguishes over the teachings in Darbee in view of Jones.

It is also noted that none of the other cited references teaches or suggests both of the features noted above with respect to the memory being a detachable IC memory card and allowing a user control of an erasing or deleting operation.

The outstanding Office Action does cite the teachings in Takahashi and Nishizawa with respect to disclosing an IC memory card as a memory. However, those teachings in Takahashi and Nishizawa are also irrelevant to the teachings in Darbee. That is, Darbee does not teach or suggest nor provide a recognition of any benefit that can be achieved by converting one of the memories 36 or 40 into a removable IC memory card.

Further, the teachings in Takahashi and Nishazawa are particularly irrelevant to the teachings in Jones for allowing a coupon processor to delete information from a memory after the information is transferred to a different memory.

In such ways, each of the currently pending claims is believe to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
GJM/SNS/cja
I:\ATTY\SNS\205602US-AM.DOC

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER, & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gregory J. Maier".

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423